



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,750	10/11/2001	Michael Ferguson	8576-001-27	7168

7590 06/21/2004

Supervisor, Patent Prosecution Services  
PIPER MARBURY RUDNICK & WOLFE LLP  
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036-2412

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THUKHANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1722

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/973,750		FERGUSON, MICHAEL	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thu Khanh T. Nguyen		1722	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Girovich (5,215,670).

Girovich teaches a drying and pelleting apparatus, comprising a raw material ventilation system (13-17, 111) including a scrubber (13) for treating air (col. 4, lines 11-14), a dryer system (101, 103) for heating the material up to 200-220°F (col. 4, lines 34-35), a pelleting system having two pellet mills (7, 8) for producing pellets at about 2-6mm (col. 4, lines 15-25), a finishing area (9, 10) for cooling the pellets and for storage and subsequent distribution, wherein the system reused captured moisture produced by the scrubber (col. 4, lines 52-66).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maffet (4,193,206).

Art Unit: 1722

Maffet teaches an apparatus and method for forming fertilizers from organic waste, which are derived directly or indirectly from living or formerly living organism and which is digested or undigested (col. 6, line 1-5). The fertilizer system comprises a scrubber for removing odor from the air (col. 8, lines 60-64), a dryer system (col. 7, lines 48-63) to pasteurize the material at about 190°-400°F (col. 9, line 2-4), to dry the pasteurized material to form powder material (particulate product; col. 9, lines 13-15), and a polluting system (36, 37) for forming uniform pellets from the powder material (col. 9, lines 28-43); wherein the palletizing system reuses captured moisture produced by the scrubber (20, 24). The apparatus further comprises a finish area ventilation system (col. 10, lines 7-23) for cooling and storing the pellets.

However, Maffet fails to disclose that the apparatus comprises two pellet mills each produces 10 tons of pellets per hours and the pellets are about 1 mm to 6.5 mm long, and the dryer is structurally ordered to receive raw material after the material is treated by the ventilation system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to recognize that the amount produced, the size and shape of the product are changeable depending on the capacity of the apparatus and the operating conditions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide multiple pellet mills to expedite the palletizing process.

It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to relocate the dryer within the system to dry the material where it is needed or where it is desired along the process. It has been held that by merely shifting the position of the parts without changing the operation of the mechanism will not render the claims

Art Unit: 1722

patentable and the placement of the mechanism is an obvious matter of design choice. In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950); In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975).

It has been held that a functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty may, in fact, be an inherent characteristic of the prior art. The applicants is required to prove that the subject matter shown in the prior art does not necessarily possess the characteristics relied on. In re Schreiber, 128 F. 3d 1473, 1478, 44 USPQ 2d, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1997); See also, In re Spada, 911 F 2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1977); In re Best, 562 F. 2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); and Ex Parte Gray, 10 USPQ 2d 1922, 1925 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989).

In Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed April 21, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant has alleged that Maffet fails to disclose a system as claimed in claim10.

Art Unit: 1722

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Maffet does disclose **all** structure limitations as claimed in the current application, the only different is the sequential locations of different mechanisms within the system. However, the location of the parts does not render the claim patentable over the prior art, if the prior art disclose all the structure limitations and perform the same functions. It has been held that by merely shifting the position of the parts without changing the operation of the mechanism will not render the claims patentable and the placement of the mechanism is an obvious matter of design choice. In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950); In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975).

Girovich ('670) is disclosed to shown that the ventilation system for treating the air prior to feeding material to the dryer and pelletizer is well known in the art.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1722

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Khanh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1136. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TN



ROBERT DAVIS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1300-1700

6/17/04